

21854

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 23

staff of the Vanderbilt University at Nashville where he moved up the ranks to become a professor of medicine.

In 1941, Dr. Blalock returned to Johns Hopkins where he did much of the work for which he always will be remembered and honored. He served as surgeon in chief at the Johns Hopkins Hospital until his retirement on June 30 of this year and was professor emeritus of surgery at the time of his death. He also had held such medical school positions as professor of surgery and director of the department of surgery. It has been truly said that Dr. Blalock is a worthy successor to the founders of modern medicine.

Mr. President, the people of his native State of Georgia join with those of his adopted State of Maryland and with the entire country in lamenting the passing of Dr. Blalock. I wish, therefore, to join in urging the adoption of the joint resolution introduced on yesterday by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] authorizing the issuance of a gold medal in recognition of Dr. Blalock's monumental contributions to medicine. Certainly this would be a richly warranted honor to the memory of this dedicated and outstanding man who has given so much to the betterment of mankind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUNDT rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe my colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS] has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have the floor at the conclusion of the morning hour. Do I correctly understand that the morning hour is over, while the quorum call is in process?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order. The unfinished business has not been laid before the Senate.

The Senator may ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—if it is the understanding that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] will not offer an amendment or make a motion during the course of his address, I shall be glad to consent.

Mr. MUNDT. That understanding is perfectly satisfactory.

## AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield until

the unfinished business is laid before the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS MADE IN THE PRESENT CAMPAIGN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I take the floor at this time, since I feel that we in the U.S. Senate, while having different political philosophies of life for this great Republic which we all love, have always had a spirit of comaraderie and respect for the integrity of each other. We are saddened to note in the press that a former colleague alludes to one of our Members as being a "raving, ranting demagogue." It shakes my faith in American politics when I hear a former majority leader of this great body, now the President, a friend of mine, a man I respect, even though I disagree with him on many political philosophies, refer to another friend and another colleague in terms which are so hateful and spiteful. I wonder what is coming over America.

There have been errors of this kind on both sides of this campaign, which fact disturbs me greatly. I had hoped that with the selection by our two great political parties of two former Members of the Senate, and one of whom still serves here, the hate campaigns would be behind us and that we could go forward in 1964 in a great political debate based on issues rather than diatribes and name calling.

It saddens me, and I am sure it saddens other Senators, regardless of their political affiliations, to hear such statements, because we all know in our hearts—to steal a phrase—that BARRY GOLDWATER is not a "raving, ranting demagogue," just as we know Lyndon B. Johnson is not a crook and is not a man of such low ethics that he should rightfully be condemned from the pulpit of one of the fine churches of the city.

We may disagree with positions which BARRY GOLDWATER has taken, as I have disagreed, as a Republican, in some instances. We may disagree with positions taken by President Johnson, another former colleague in the Senate, as I have disagreed quite frequently. But to me that is the American way. I know, and you know, that BARRY GOLDWATER is a man of intelligence, integrity, prudence, and honesty.

While lesser politicians and smaller men may run around the country disseminating all kinds of invective, I am disturbed when candidates for high office—Presidents and candidates for President and Vice President themselves—engage in this kind of guttersniping. If this campaign is to be debased by name calling and the arousing of hate, it will destroy the American image around the world. We become no better than the Communists, who have built an empire on hate. The language utilized between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, the Russian and Chinese Communist leaders today, is no worse than some of the snide

criticisms and dishonest attacks being tossed across party lines in public debate in the political hustings today by candidates for high office.

Our candidate in the Republican Party has erred in some of his remarks. President Johnson has erred. Our delightful colleague, Senator HUMPHREY, has made some pretty astonishing sallies into the field of hyperbolic criticism as when he referred to Senator GOLDWATER as "irresponsible." So has BILL MILLER.

I am not trying to blame any one party, but I am trying, if I can, to quicken the conscience of America and stimulate some self-restraint on the part of candidates for high office before we get so deep in the mire that, no matter who wins the Presidency, only America can become the loser.

It so happens that a research friend of mine made a research of political campaigns, contained in a report called "Thirty Years of Venom," on which I intended to speak on a later occasion, while the Senate is spinning its wheels and killing a little time, but now I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the documentation of venom and hate as it has been recorded by this researcher over the past 30 years and which I shall insert in the RECORD at the end of this presentation, I had hoped had ended an era. For the good of our Christian civilization and the preservation of the American way, I had hoped it had stopped. I had hoped to use the documentation to show that our political campaigns have changed. On the basis of what I have heard thus far in this campaign, they have changed, but they have changed for the worse. They have become dirtier instead of cleaner. Men in high places have become more reckless in what they say, instead of more self-restrained.

I cannot see how the candidate, President Lyndon Johnson, can speak of love in one breath and then go to the old Democratic theme of venom in another by identifying an opponent as a "raving, ranting demagogue."

This is catching. On the same page of the Washington Post this morning, which reported that our President had impetuously made such an ad lib attack upon BARRY GOLDWATER by innuendo and indirection, there appears a report of another statement, by a Member of the other body, to the effect that Senator GOLDWATER's thinking was "Close to madness."

There are issues to be discussed. There are differences to be defined. When Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and Presidents and presidential and vice-presidential candidates decide to see if they can win votes of Americans by determining which one can make the most devastating diatribe against the other, it is an insult to the intelligence of American voters.

I do not know what has happened to my old friend Charley Taft out in